

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-70, 74-75, 77, 82-88, 92, and 97 are canceled and claims 71-73, 76, 78-81, 89-91, 93-96, and 98-100 are pending in the application.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for participating in a telephone interview on 20 June 2008. During the interview, the objections to the drawings as well as proposed drawing amendments were discussed. In addition, the §112 rejections of the claims were discussed. During the interview, the Examiner provisionally agreed that using the term "substrate" instead of "structure" may overcome the §112 rejection.

To correct the inadvertent use of numeral 100 in both Figure 9 and Figure 11, Figure 9 has been amended as well as two paragraphs of the specification as noted above.

Figures 11 and 12 have been amended to clarify the invention. During the interview, the Examiner provisionally agreed that these amendments would overcome the objections to the drawings raised by the Examiner in the most recent office action.

Claims 71-73, 76, 78-81, and 89-100 stand rejected under §112 paragraphs 1 and 2 as failing to comply with the written description requirement and as being indefinite. The Examiner asserts that the use of the term "structure" in these claims is indefinite because the metes and bounds of the term "structure" in the specification have not been clearly defined.

Claims 71, 96, 98, 99, and 100 have been amended to replace the term “structure” with the term “substrate.” Support for use of the term substrate may be found, at least, in Figures 11 and 12 and paragraphs 79-84 of the specification. Applicant asserts that the use of the term “substrate” renders these claims definite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 71 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 92. Claim 92 stands rejected under the §112 rejection described above, but has not been additionally rejected on other grounds. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that based on the discussion related to the §112 rejection described above, claim 71 is allowable.

Claims 98 and 99 have limitations similar to claim 71. Thus, Applicant asserts that claims 98 and 99 are allowable for the reasons described above in relation to claim 71.

Claim 100 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 96. Claim 96 stands rejected under the §112 rejection described above, but has not been additionally rejected on other grounds. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that based on the discussion related to the §112 rejection described above, claim 100 is allowable.

Claims 71-73, 76, 78-81, 89-91, 93-96, and 98-100 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner's next action be a Notice of Allowance formally allowing all of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 23 June 2008

By: Paul S. Holdaway  
Paul S. Holdaway  
Reg. No. 56,376